

FBI Created 17 False Flag Terrorist Attacks

wordpress.com

RSS



*FBI agent being trained to shoot at paper terrorists.
(Photo credit: Wikipedia)*

According to Judge Andrew Napolitano, in the past 10 years, there've been 20 Terrorist plots against the US. Three of those plots were real but were discovered and stopped by private Americans. The other 17 were created—and then stopped—by the FBI.

The apparent purpose of these false flag operations was to deceive Americans into believing we're under attack by foreign or domestic terrorists who are fictional. Based on the false belief that we're being persistently attacked, Americans tend to accept and even our government's invasions of

foreign countries and our own growing police state.

If you want to fly on an airplane, you must first be x-rayed or groped based, in part, on 17 plots created by the FBI to prove the existence of terrorists who don't actually exist.

Every government agent—right up to the President—who authorized or participated in such fraudulent terrorist attacks should be tried for treason and, if found guilty, hanged by the neck until dead.

video 00:05:05

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5LDw7ppLK7w>

Here's an article from the New York Times that explains that the FBI is not **finding** terrorists, so much as creating and grooming people who are upset with government to become "terrorists" in "sting operations". This [article](#) claims that "Of the 22 most frightening plans for attacks since 9/11 on American soil, 14 were developed in [FBI] sting operations." These numbers don't precisely match Judge Napolitano's, but they're similar.

More, the article interests me in that it reveals that most defendants charged in these "sting operations" claim "entrapment" for their defense and thereby lose in court. That tells me that "entrapment" is probably an "[affirmative defense](#)" which, as I've previously explained, is first and foremost a **confession**.

I.e., you can't claim to have been "entrapped" into committing a crime without first implicitly confessing that you did, in fact, commit the alleged crime. Once you make any affirmative defense/confession, the prosecution's case is made, and the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove that, except for the influence exerted by the FBI (or whoever), the defendant would not have committed the crime. Because it's almost impossible for the defendant to prove his state of mind and intent, convicting fools who make affirmative defenses is like shooting fish in a barrel. If the defendant had not made an affirmative defense, the burden of proof would remain **on the prosecution** to prove the defendant's state of mind/state.

The most important consequence of using the affirmative defense of entrapment to excuse some alleged criminal act inspired by the FBI (or some other governmental agency) is that such defense constitutes a **confession** that you have attempted to commit a crime.

The second most important consequence may be that "entrapment" implicitly admits that the person who

tried to entrap the defendant was a **government agent**. If so, by alleging that he was “entrapped” by a **government agent**, the **defendant** cloaks that government agent with “**official immunity**” that might not otherwise exist. In other words, if a defendant doesn’t claim “entrapment,” the alleged “government agent” might be just as liable for the offense as the defendant.

If I were being prosecuted for attempting to commit some “terrorist act” that had been inspired by a purported FBI agent, I might not try a defense of entrapment. I might instead challenge the credentials of the government agent, attempt to prove that he’s merely a private actor, corporate employee, and the real “brains” behind the terror plot. I would not thereby confess to the alleged “crime”. By not confessing, I’d make the prosecution prove every element of the crime, including venue (The State vs. this state), and I might sue the purported FBI agent for misleading and deceiving me. I’d be careful to create evidence that the alleged “government agent” was the brains behind the crime and thus a co-defendant rather than some “official”. I’d argue that if I were to be sentenced to 5 years, my co-defendant should be sentenced to 10.

☺